

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claims 6 and 13, respectively. Claims 6 and 13 have been canceled accordingly. Claims 16-19 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found in the existing claims and page 11, lines 1-7 of the specification, for example. Accordingly, Claims 1, 2, 4-5, 7-12, and 14-19 are pending in this application. The amendments do not constitute the addition of any new matter to the specification. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-12, 14 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (U.S. 2002/0150722 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1 and 10 recite that a surface fine concavo-convex structure is formed by particles having a particle size of 2 to 5  $\mu\text{m}$ , an average of center line surface roughness (Ra) satisfies the equation:  $0.1 \leq \text{Ra} \leq 0.17\mu\text{m}$ , and an average of ten-point surface roughness (Rz) satisfies the equation:  $\text{Rz} \leq 9 \cdot \text{Ra}$ .

As shown in the table below, Examples 1 and 2 of the present application fulfill the limitations of the current Claims 1 and 10 and show advantageous effects (no glare), as compared with Examples 3 and 4 which do not fulfill the above specific Ra of Claims 1 and 10.

	Particle Size ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	Ra ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	Rz/Ra	Glare
Ex. 1	3.5	0.150	8.53	No glare
Ex. 2	3.5	0.120	7.17	No glare
Ex. 3	3.5	0.240	6.50	A little glare
Ex. 4	3.5	0.220	7.09	A little glare

Suzuki discloses general ranges of the particle size, Ra, and Rz/Ra, but does not teach the specific ranges of the particle size, Ra, and Rz/Ra recited in Claim 1 and 10. By using a particle size of 2-5  $\mu\text{m}$ ,  $0.1 \leq \text{Ra} \leq 0.17\mu\text{m}$ , and  $\text{Rz} \leq 9 \cdot \text{Ra}$ , glare can be completely controlled. This

**Appl. No.** : **10/029,721**  
**Filed** : **December 20, 2001**

combination exhibits a synergic effect, and could not be obvious over Suzuki. Suzuki simply discloses general ranges and examples which do not use the above specific combination. See the table below showing Suzuki's examples (the numbers in bold values are outside the specific ranges recited in Claims 1 and 10).

	Particle Size ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	Ra ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	Rz/Ra
Ex. 1	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.174</b>	6.84
Ex. 2	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.185</b>	<b>9.03</b>
Ex. 3	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.197</b>	<b>11.17</b>
Ex. 4	<b>1.3/1.5</b>	0.167	<b>10.54</b>
Ex. 5	3.5	<b>0.186</b>	<b>11.77</b>
Ex. 6	5	<b>0.230</b>	<b>12.09</b>
Ex. 7	4	<b>0.191</b>	<b>10.31</b>

Because the specific combination recited in Claims 1 and 10 provides significant effect of controlled glare, Suzuki's teachings are too general and could not lead to Claims 1 and 10. Thus, Claims 1 and 10 could not be obvious over Suzuki. However, in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 10 by incorporating the limitations of Claims 6 and 13, respectively, which have not been rejected on this ground. Thus, Claims 1 and 10 as amended herein (and the remaining dependent claims) could not be obvious over Suzuki and also this rejection is moot.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (U.S. 2002/0150722 A1) as applied above, and further in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. 5,770,306). Claims 6 and 13 have been incorporated into Claims 1 and 10, respectively and have been canceled. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As explained above, Suzuki could not render Claims 1 and 10 obvious. Suzuki et al. is irrelevant to the specific combination of the particle size, Ra, and Ra/Rz. Thus, a combination of Suzuki and Suzuki et al. could not lead to Claims 1 and 10.

Appl. No. : 10/029,721  
Filed : December 20, 2001

Further, although Suzuki et al. uses a low refractive index layer (13), the low refractive index layer is formed on an ultrafine particle layer (22), not the concavo-convex structure surface recited in Claims 1 and 10. Particles used in the ultrafine particle layer (22) have a particle diameter of no more than 200 nm (0.2  $\mu\text{m}$ ), more preferably 1 to 100 nm (0.001-0.1  $\mu\text{m}$ ). In contrast, particles used in the concavo-convex structure surface have a particle size of 2-5  $\mu\text{m}$ . Further, the ultrafine particle layer (22) is used for controlling refractive index, whereas the concavo-convex structure layer is used for controlling glare. Thus, clearly, Suzuki et al. does not teach or suggest not only a combination of a low refractive index layer and a concavo-convex structure surface, but also a motivation to combine a low refractive index layer and a concavo-convex structure surface. Likewise, Suzuki does not teach or even suggest a combination of a low refractive index layer and a concavo-convex structure surface. Thus, a combination of Suzuki and Suzuki et al. could not lead to Claims 1 and 10 as amended herein, and Claims 1 and 10 and their dependent claims could not be obvious. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

#### New Claims

Claims 16-19 have been added.

Claims 16 and 18 further recite that the low refractive layer comprises fluorinated polysiloxanes. Neither Suzuki nor Suzuki et al. teaches or suggests the above. These claims could not be obvious over the references.

Claims 17 and 19 further recites that the low refractive layer has a thickness of about 0.05  $\mu\text{m}$  to about 0.3  $\mu\text{m}$ . Neither Suzuki nor Suzuki et al. teaches or suggests the above. These claims could not be obvious over the references.

#### CONCLUSION

In light of the Applicant's foregoing Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Appl. No. : 10/029,721  
Filed : December 20, 2001

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: March 29, 2004

By: 

Katsuhiro Arai

Registration No. 43,315

Agent of Record

(949) 760-0404

H:\DOCS\TOS\UNIU47.001AUS\UNIU47.001AUS.AMEND2.DOC  
032904